

MSR Stakeholder Working Group

Orange/Villa Park/Orange Sphere of Influence

January 23, 2004

Meeting Minutes - Final

I. Call to Order:

The meeting began shortly after 1:00 pm with a welcome statement from Susan Wilson, LAFCO Vice-Chair. All stakeholders were in attendance except for Ken Lee from LAFCO.

II. Agenda/Desired Outcomes:

The facilitator reviewed the meeting agenda and desired outcomes. The group acknowledged the intent of the agenda and desired outcomes for the meeting which include agreeing on the process that the working group will use to develop a 20 year vision and the work plan that the group will follow.

III. Introductions/Expectations:

Each Working Group member was asked to introduce him/herself and briefly describe what their expectation for success would be at the end of the meeting series. A summary of expressed expectations include:

- Vision for the community
- Roadmap for future service provision
- How to provide the most efficient services in the most cost-effective way
- Impact of development on undeveloped rural areas
- Dialogue regarding goals and what we have in common
- Consensus on recommendations for future
- Whole, integrated City
- How to deal with service to east Orange area
- Think outside the box – focus on the future, look for opportunities
- Build collaborations
- Identify full service needs
- Plan for future, agree how to coordinate services to avoid conflict later
- Infrastructure for service provision 20 – 50 years out
- Protect and enhance quality of life, ensure community has a voice
- Protect rural areas
- Balance open space, development and infrastructure
- Produce a fair and balanced result which takes all the agencies needs into consideration
- Explore service provision options, create solutions proactively
- Create working relationships
- Get everyone invested in staying the course and finding solutions

IV. Working Group Process:

The facilitator engaged the group in a series of discussion topics regarding the working group process and ground rules. Each topic culminated in consensus agreement by the group. The topics included:

Discussion Guidelines:

- Commit to participate (commit to make the meetings and process succeed and represent your constituency)
- Comment during meeting, not after
- Share time – allow all members a chance to comment
- Maintain integrity of decisions & intent (each member's responsibility to ensure clarity/understanding)
- Quote substance of discussion and not the individual speaking
- Avoid interrupting
- Avoid side conversations
- Feedback to facilitator
- Respect (for ideas & individuals)

Decision Point – *Discussion Guidelines – Adopted by consensus as stated*

Role of Working Group:

- Achieve purpose as set out
- Expectation that all members will attend all working group meetings
- No alternates at this time – will revisit in future if need arises

Decision Point – *Adopted by consensus as stated*

Role of LAFCO:

- Dual Role
 - Full working group participant
 - Support staff to working group
 - Minutes
 - Update workbook materials
 - Assemble and distribute data and other info to group
 - Draft vision plan at the end of the process for group's editing, approval

Role of Technical Advisory Committees (TACs):

- Technical issues identified by the group would be tackled by committees of technical experts
- Technical advisory will meet separate from the working group committee and present findings to the working group
- Working group assigns issues for technical study
- Working group defines the composition of the technical committee – working group members could also participate on TACs
- Water / sewer study is a predetermined issue for this MSR focus area. The Keith Companies (TKC) is currently on contract with LAFCO to participate in the a utilities study of the East Orange sphere area

Role of Facilitator:

- Timekeeper
- Achieve desired outcomes

- Ensure outcomes are fair & representative of the group

Decision making:

- Consensus approach to decisions
- Everyone must agree by stating an active “yes” or standing aside or the decision will not move forward
- One “no” will stop a decision from moving forward
- Include all members in decisions
- Must agree to a decision or > say no or > stand aside – no abstentions
- If stand aside, reason must be stated

Decision Point – ***Adopted by consensus as stated***

Role of the Press:

The working group engaged in some discussion on how to deal with inquiries from the press. There were two distinctions that emerged from the discussion:

1. Specific comments made during the meetings would not be shared outside the meetings
2. Talking with the press should not be confused with reporting back to each member’s representative community/agency

Progression through the discussion topic led to clarity regarding talking with the press. The commitment not to discuss the meeting with the press is based on creating an environment of trust within the working group. If asked to present reports to community or agency, working group members agreed to limit the content of their reports to the substance of the discussions and not any individual’s comments per the agreed-upon discussion guidelines. Group consensus on the role of the press included:

- Working group members will not give interviews with the press
- All press inquiries will be directed to LAFCO
- Press is welcome to attend meetings as a member of the public

Decision Point – ***Adopted by consensus as stated***

Role of the Public:

- The public is welcome to attend all meetings
- Public comment period will be limited to a total of 15 minutes taken at the beginning of each meeting; three minutes per person
- Any person wishing to speak before the group will be asked to fill out a speaker card

Decision Point – ***Adopted by consensus as stated***

V. Purpose:

The group reviewed and edited the draft purpose statement prepared for the meeting. The *draft* statement read as follows:

The purpose of the Municipal Service Review (MSR) Stakeholder Working Group is to develop a 20-year vision plan which addresses future governance and municipal service delivery issues in the MSR focus area. The vision plan will be based on sound demographic, technical, an fiscal data, and designed to maintain or enhance the quality of life within the MSR focus area.

There was a fair amount of discussion on the purpose statement. The essence of the comments reflected a concern over the terms “*vision*” plan and “*municipal*” service delivery. The concern with the use of the word *vision* related to the ambiguity that term might convey as “the plan” is presented to others outside the stakeholder group. It was suggested that it might be more reflective of the group’s purpose to call it a *20-year municipal services plan*. The consensus was to leave the word *vision* in the purpose statement for now and revisit it if necessary. Some group members expressed a concern that the term *municipal* did not accurately reflect the diversity of services provided in the area, that the term conveyed the notion of services provided by a “city”. The group settled on use of the term *community* services in place of *municipal* services with the understanding that it is inclusive of all services such as fire, police, water, power, wastewater etc. In the end two slight modifications were made to the draft statement to clarify the purpose for group consensus. LAFCO will produce the new purpose statement for the next meeting.

The edited statement reads as follows:

The purpose of the Municipal Service Review (MSR) Stakeholder Working Group is to develop a 20-year vision plan which addresses future governance *needs* and *community* service delivery issues in the MSR focus area. The vision plan will be based on sound demographic, technical, and fiscal data, and designed to maintain or enhance the quality of life within the MSR focus area.

Decision Point – ***Adopted by consensus as stated with two members standing aside***

VI. Work Plan:

The group was given an opportunity to review and discuss the completeness of the work plan and whether or not it seemed viable and plausible given the proposed 10-meeting schedule. Desired outcomes, topics and tasks and assignments were reviewed for each of the ten meetings.

There was some discussion around the data that would be generated and by whom. It was clarified that technical advisory committees may be created and used for specific data compilation and analysis by request from the working group. The working group would recognize the need for technical advisory committees as the group progresses through the work plan.

There was some expressed concern about assigning technical advisory committees at meeting #2 when the group may not have identified the specific issues for study that early in the process. It was clarified that the TACs assigned at meeting #2 would be responsible for generating demographic and other trending data for presentation to the working group during meeting #4. Issue-specific TACs would be assigned later in the meeting schedule (meeting #5) once issues and gaps are identified by the working group.

A suggestion was made to tap into the toll road agency’s data regarding consolidation. The data is current, available and could be valuable.

LAFCO was asked to share the scope of work for The Keith Companies contract to conduct a utilities study of the East Orange development area. LAFCO agreed to email a copy of that scope to all working group members.

A request was made to discuss the scope of the TKC study at the next meeting to compare it with the group's needs.

The group agreed to adopt the work plan with acknowledgement that it may be reviewed or revised as needed.

More discussion followed regarding the esoteric nature of "quality of life", seeking to understand how it relates to a 20-year plan for municipal service provision. Comments and unanswered questions included:

- Can't stop growth but we can plan for it
- Can't maintain or enhance quality of life without planning
- Regarding density - what are the density models for this area and are they going to change over time -
- Does density impact quality of life

Decision Point -**Adopted by consensus** as stated *(The group agreed to adopt the work plan acknowledging that it may be reviewed or revised as needed. The group can revisit the work plan at the top of each agenda)*

VII. Meeting Logistics:

The working group scheduled the remaining nine successive meetings though meeting #10 of the current work plan. The group selected a Friday morning timeslot from 10:00 am to 1:00 pm with the exception of March 12 which will be scheduled from 9:00 to noon. The location remains the same, the Orange Public Library El Modena Branch Library community room.

LAFCO agreed to distribute a revised calendar highlighting all scheduled meetings to working group members by Monday, January 26, 2004.

VIII. Next Steps:

Working group members were referred to the "assignments" section of the work plan for homework for the next meeting. Members were asked to provide LAFCO with maps of agency service delivery areas and agency or community profiles prior to meeting #2. LAFCO would then compile the information for distribution back to working group members.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting concluded and was adjourned at 3:40 pm.